



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/541,461	03/31/2000	ABRAHAM NATHAN	1018.071US1	3662

23460 7590 04/19/2004

LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD
TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900
180 NORTH STETSON AVENUE
CHICAGO, IL 60601-6780

EXAMINER

NARAYANASWAMY, SINDYA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

14

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/541,461

Applicant(s)

NATHAN ET AL.

Examiner

Sindya Narayanaswamy

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 19-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2174

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 19-25 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 19-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Falck et al., US-6,360,265.

4. As per claim 19, Falck et al. teaches a method for securing data communication between a client in an internal network and a server in an external network by way of a proxy server in the internal network (col. 1, lines 45-51), the method comprising: performing at the proxy server a network address a network address translation upon a stream of packets originating from the client (col. 1, line 53); filtering at the proxy server the stream of packets such that the filtering is transparent to the client; and transmitting at the proxy server the packets to the server after the packets are filtered (*firewall function filters*) (col. 1, line 54).

Art Unit: 2174

5. As per claim 20, teaches the method comprising filtering at the proxy server a second stream of packets originating from the server in the external network; performing at the proxy server a reverse network address translation upon the packets in the second stream; and transmitting at the proxy server the packets in the second stream; and transmitting at the proxy server the packets in the second stream after the packets are filtered (*packet traffic incoming*) (col. 1, lines 58-61).

6. As per claim 21, is similar in scope to claim 19 and is therefore rejected on the same basis.

7. As per claims 22 and 23, they are the system claims of claims 19 and 20, and are therefore rejected on the same basis.

8. As per claims 24 and 25, they are similar in scope to claims 19 and 20 are therefore rejected on the same basis.

Response to Argument

1. In the remarks, applicant has argued in substance that:

(1) The Falck reference is not 102(b) prior art with respect to the present invention.

(2) Falck does not teach performing network address translation and packet stream filtering at the same proxy server.

Art Unit: 2174

(3) Nothing in Falck teaches or discloses the performing of proxy server filtering of a stream of packets "such that the filtering is transparent to the client," an element of each of applicants' independent claims.

(4) Applicant has defined in the specification that a proxy server is an application-level gateway.

2. Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments and resubmits that

As to point (1), the applicant's claims are rejected as being anticipated by Falck under 102(e).

As to point (2), Falck does perform network address translation and packet stream filtering at the same proxy server (NAT). This is explained in detail in col. 1, lines 53-62. The NAT performs a firewall function, thereby filtering unwanted packets.

As to point (3), Falck teaches that the network address translation is done within the NAT proxy, this proxy being separate from the client. The network address translation done within the NAT is transparent to the client (Fig. 1, 102, 106; col. 9, lines 20-33).

As to point (4), applicant has not explicitly stated in the claim language that the proxy server refers to an application-level gateway.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sindya Narayanaswamy whose telephone number is (703) 305-8473. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am to 5 pm, first Fridays off.

Art Unit: 2174

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sindya Narayanaswamy
April 16, 2004

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100